

Application No. 09/921,097  
Amendment dated August 28, 2007

### **REMARKS**

The Examiner and Primary Examiner Andrew Koenig are thanked for the courtesy extended during the personal interview with Applicant's representatives on August 23, 2007. Applicant is submitting this formal reply pursuant to the Examiner's instructions during the interview and as set forth in the Interview Summary ("Interview Summary") dated August 23, 2007. Applicant amended the title, amended claims 1-56 and 59-65, and added new dependent claims 66-70 to further define Applicant's claimed invention. Virtually all the amendments to the dependent claims were made for consistency with the changes made to the language of the independent claims, including changing the "steps language" to "acts language" and not to distinguish over the cited art.

Consistent with the Interview Summary, Applicant amended all of the independent claims. Applicant amended independent claims 1, 31, and 43 to recite "delivering the video to a client application accessible by a user" and "interrupting the delivery of the video to the client application at a point in time after the interacting with the interface link." Applicant amended independent claim 16 to recite "delivering the video from a remote location over a network to a client application accessible by a user" and "interrupting the delivery of the video from the remote location over the network to the client application...at a point in time after the interacting with the interface link." Applicant amended independent claim 55 to recite "delivering the video from a remote site to a client application accessible by a user" and "interrupting the delivery of the video from the remote site to the client application at a point in time after the interacting with the interface link." Applicant further amended independent claims 1, 16, and 55 to recite continuing the delivery of the video "to the client application" from "the point in time when the delivery of the video was interrupted" after "the interacting with the interface link" in claims 1 and 16, and after "the accessing of the commerce site" in claim 55. Applicant amended independent claim 59 to recite the "creating a link program adapted to interrupt delivery of the video from the remote storage medium to a

Application No. 09/921,097  
Amendment dated August 28, 2007

client application accessible by a user at a second site" and "interrupting the delivery of the video to the client application in response to interacting with the link program."

Support for the amendments to independent claims 1, 16, 31, 43, 55, and 59 can be found in the specification at least on page 8, lines 12-14; page 12, lines 3-5; page 17, lines 19-24; page 18, lines 1-11; page 13, line 1 through page 14, line 8; and FIG. 4. No new matter has been added. Applicant submits that the amendments to the independent claims overcome the cited art as set forth in the Interview Summary.

Applicant further amended independent claims 1, 31, 43, 55, and 59 to delete recitations deemed unnecessary to overcome the cited prior art. Specifically, Applicant deleted the recitations of interrupting the display of the video on the visual display and continuing the display of the video on the visual display from independent claims 1, 31, 43, 55, and 59. The recitations deleted from the independent claims have been rewritten as newly added dependent claims 66-70, dependent from one of claims 1, 31, 43, 55, and 59, respectively. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action dated February 23, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 16-19, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,483,986 to Krapf ("Krapf"); rejected claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 31-33, 35 and 37-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,929,849 to Kikinis ("Kikinis"); rejected claims 55, 56, and 59-63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Krapf; and rejected claims 43-45, 47, 49, 50-54, 64, and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf and Kikinis in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0007493 to Butler ("Butler").

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 16, as amended, is novel over Krapf. It is submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claim 16, and claims 17-19, 27 and 28 dependent therefrom, has been overcome. For the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Krapf with Kikinis as proposed by the Examiner would not disclose or suggest all of the recitations of independent claims 1, 31, and 55. Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 43 over Krapf and Kikinis in view of Butler, Applicant respectfully

Application No. 09/921,097  
Amendment dated August 28, 2007

submits that the combination of Krapf and Kikinis with Butler as proposed by the Examiner would not disclose or suggest all of the recitations of independent claim 43. For the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 59, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Kikinis and Krapf as proposed by the Examiner would not disclose or suggest all of the recitations of independent claim 59.

Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 16, 31, 43, 55, and 59, as amended, are allowable over the cited references. The rejections of dependent claims 2-6, 8, 10-15, 17-19, 27, 28, 32, 33, 35, 37-42, 44, 45, 47, 49, 50-54, 56, and 60-65 are rendered moot at least because these claims depend from an allowable independent claim, or claims dependent therefrom. Applicant submits that the Examiner's rejections of these claims have been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf in view of Kikinis; rejected claims 7 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf and Kikinis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,738 to Call ("Call"); rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf in view of Call; rejected claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf, Kikinis, and Butler in view of Call; rejected claims 9 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf and Kikinis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,184,878 to Alonso ("Alonso"); and rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf in view of Alonso. Applicant submits that the rejections of claims 7, 9, 20-26, 29, 30, 34, 36, and 46 are rendered moot at least because these claims depend from an allowable independent claim, or claims dependent therefrom.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims, as amended, are patentable. Therefore, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding rejections in view of the preceding comments. Issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance of the claims is earnestly solicited.

To the extent any extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this reply, such extension is hereby respectfully requested. If there are any

Application No. 09/921,097  
Amendment dated August 28, 2007

fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTIN & FERRARO, LLP

Dated: August 28, 2007

By: 

Amedeo F. Ferraro  
Registration No. 37,129

1557 Lake O'Pines Street, NE  
Hartville, Ohio 44632  
Telephone: (310) 286-9800  
Facsimile: (310) 286-2795